

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Bryan Shawn Blevins,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

Horry County; Deborah Hipp; Southern  
Health Partners; Tom Fox,  
Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

C.A. No.: 4:11-03267-RBH

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Bryan Blevins, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on December 1, 2011. This matter is before the court for review of two Reports and Recommendation (“R&Rs”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. In the first R&R [Doc. # 59], the Magistrate Judge recommends granting summary judgment in favor of Defendant Southern Health Partners. In the second R&R [Doc. # 62], the Magistrate Judge recommends granting summary judgment in favor of remaining Defendants Horry County, Deborah Hipp, and Tom Fox.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the R&R to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

No party has filed objections to either R&R. In the absence of objections to an R&R of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error in either the first R&R [Doc. # 59], or the second R&R [Doc. # 62]. Accordingly, both R&Rs of the Magistrate Judge are adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

**ORDERED** that Defendant Southern Health Partners’ Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. # 37] is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Defendants Horry County, Deborah Hipp, and Tom Fox’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Doc. # 48] is **GRANTED**. This case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice in its entirety.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/ R. Bryan Harwell  
R. Bryan Harwell  
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina  
November 30, 2012